1 2 3 4 5 6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 7 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA** 8 9 10 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 11 Plaintiff, Case No. 2:08-CR-00025-KJD-LRL 12 <u>ORDER</u> v. 13 LORENZO TUCKER, 14 Defendant. 15 16 Before the Court is Defendant Lorenzo Tucker's Motion to Vacate under 28 U.S.C. 2255 17 (#150). Also before the Court are Defendant's Motion for Expedited Hearing (#149); Motion for 18 Default Judgment on Failure to Answer (#152); and Motion for Final Default (#158). 19 I. Analysis 20 The Court has reviewed Defendant's Motion to Vacate (#150), including Defendant's 21 Affidavit of Inquiry, Notice of Intent (#139) incorporated by reference in Defendant's Motion. 22 Defendant's Motion (#150) is without merit and is hereby **DENIED**. Further, as this Motion forms 23 the basis for all remaining Motions, they are hereby **DENIED** as moot. 24 Additionally, Defendant is under the incorrect impression that the Government is required to 25 respond to his § 2255 Motion. If it plainly appears that the defendant is not entitled to relief, the court

must dismiss the motion. Rules Governing § 2255 Proceedings, Rule 4, 28 U.S.C. foll. § 2255. Such

26

is the case here. Only if the court does not dismiss the motion will the court order the United States attorney to file a response. Id. Accordingly, no error has been committed by the Government in not responding to Defendant's motions. This fact alone requires denial of Defendant's Motions for Default (##152 and 158). II. Conclusion Defendant's Motion to Vacate under 28 U.S.C. 2255 (#150) is **HEREBY DENIED**. Defendant's remaining Motions (## 149, 152, and 158) are also **DENIED** as moot. DATED this 9th day of September 2013. Kent J. Dawson United States District Judge